

wherein said computer system displays an up-to-date listing of available information.

25. (Twice Amended) An apparatus for displaying information to a user of a computer system, comprising:

a viewer for dynamically generating a list of books currently available to the user;

and

a display device for displaying said list of currently available books;

wherein said viewer dynamically generates said list of books in response to a request by indexing each file and book of a predetermined folder for files of a first type and scanning said files of a first type for at least one HTML meta-tag of a predetermined type in order to determine data to be added to said list of books.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 2-23 and 25-61 remain pending. Claims 1 and 24 have been canceled. Claims 2 and 25 have been amended to incorporate the features of claims 1 and 24, respectively. These amendments do not introduce new matter nor raise any new issues that require further consideration or search.

I. CLAIMS 60-61

In the second section of the Office Action, claims 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regards to the rejection of claim 60, it is asserted that in claim 60, lines 6-7, the phrase "determining ... fails to either exist or be up-to-date" contradicts lines 3-5 of the claim, under the assumption that an "and" condition is required by lines 3-5. However, according to the present invention, when a user activates the help viewer of the present

invention, the help viewer first determines whether a table of contents for the help system already exists. If it does already exist, the help viewer determines whether the table of contents is up-to-date. Thus, the second step of lines 4-5 is a conditional step that is only carried out if the first step returns a positive result, i.e., that a table of contents exists. In other words, only one of the two conditions can exist at any given time, namely the table of contents does not exist, or it does exist and is not up-to-date. Hence, as recited in claim 60, if the table of contents does not exist or is not up-to-date, then the help viewer begins the process of generating or regenerating the table of contents. [See also the present application, page 7, lines 4-6]. The assumption that is implicit in the rejection, namely that both conditions occur together, is not correct. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 60-61 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

II. CLAIMS 6-15, 29-38, AND 46-59

In section three of the Office Action, claims 6-15, 29-38, and 46-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by DeRose et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,544) (hereinafter "DeRose"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. CLAIMS 6, 29, 46, AND 57

As discussed in greater detail in Applicants' prior response, the present invention is directed to a system that automatically provides a user with a table of contents that is reflective of the information that is currently available on a computer system. The table of contents is generated by scanning specific files to identify those of a *particular* type. For instance, one implementation of the invention can be used to provide a table of contents for a "Help" System in a computer. In such an implementation, the files stored on the computer (and perhaps elsewhere) are scanned to locate those which pertain to the Help System. Once located, these files are then further analyzed for pre-defined information, such as HTML meta-tags. These meta-tags indicate the information that is to be displayed in the table of contents, such as the title of a chapter in the Help System. The information

gathered is merged with pre-defined HTML template files that control the formatting and presentation of the information. The resulting table of contents which is provided to the user accurately reflects the current contents of the information system.

DeRose does not anticipate independent claim 6 of the present invention, because DeRose does not disclose all of the elements recited in claim 6. For example, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the step of "indexing each file and a first level of each book of a predetermined folder for *files* of a first type," as recited in claim 6. This is due to the fact that DeRose is directed to an entirely different problem from the present invention, and the solution to that problem does not require or utilize such an indexing process.

More particularly, DeRose notes several problems with the current structure of the WWW and the protocols used thereon. For instance, there is no protocol which allows access to only a portion of a large document. To provide acceptable performance, publishers currently maintain a large document as a collection of small document fragments, which leads to document management problems and burdens for the publishers. In addition, there is no protocol for linking to targets that are a portion of a document. Therefore, it is a stated aim of DeRose to provide a mechanism for accessing only a portion of a large electronically published document, and to automatically determine what portion of the document to select as a previous portion or a next portion *without* maintaining separate data files of each portion of the document. [See DeRose, col. 4, lines 34-38].

As pointed out in Applicants' previous response, to solve these and other related problems, DeRose discloses a method of using meta-tags inserted into large electronic documents to provide easier retrieval and access to selected portions of the document over remote connections. According to DeRose, through the use of meta-tags, a document is broken down into parts (e.g., books, chapters, pages, and so forth). Once broken down, a user can retrieve, view, and navigate between *self-contained* fragments of a document. The table of contents that are created for a document by DeRose allow a user to access a given part or portion of the document. Thus, DeRose teaches a method that allows a user to retrieve portions (i.e., self-contained fragments) of an individual document.

Since DeRose is only concerned with the contents of a single document at a time, DeRose does not teach looking outside that single document for any additional information. In other words, since the information required by DeRose is wholly contained within an individual file, DeRose does not disclose or suggest a need for locating or retrieving information outside of the individual document. Consequently, since DeRose applies to the contents of an individual document, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the step of indexing each file and a first level of each book of a predetermined folder for *files* of a first type.

In addition, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the step of scanning the files of a first type for at least one HTML meta-tag of a predetermined type in order to determine first data to be added to a first table of contents, as also recited in claim 6. As noted previously, DeRose provides a method by which a user can access individual sections of a document. The information required by DeRose to perform this method is completely contained within the document itself (i.e., in the embedded meta-tags). Consequently, DeRose does not disclose or suggest a need to scan for files to retrieve information residing outside of an individual file.

On page four in the fifth section of the Office Action, with regards to claims 6-15, 29-38, and 46-59, it is asserted that DeRose teaches a "Web site" which comprises a plurality of related HTML documents listed in a table of contents. It is further asserted that for each document, a second table of contents for the document is generated to help downloading a specific portion of the document instead of the entire document to reduce processing time. It is contended that Applicants appear to take the example given by DeRose at column 18, lines 22-24 as DeRose's invention and argue that DeRose's invention deals with a single document only and that Applicants' argument is "not true" when DeRose is considered as a whole.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, according to the express teachings of DeRose, DeRose discloses a method of demarcating a single document to permit a user to view self-contained document fragments. Consequently, DeRose eliminates the need to generate many small documents with hyperlinks between them. How *collections* of the

individual documents are arranged and organized on a "Web site" is irrelevant to DeRose, because DeRose is only focused on how portions of the contents of a single document can be easily retrieved in any given session. In other words, DeRose neither discloses or suggests a method for generating a table of contents for the collection of individual documents, because DeRose is focused on how to retrieve portions of the contents of an individual document. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, considering the patent as a whole, DeRose is directed to individual documents only. Thus, since DeRose is only focused on the contents of an individual document at a time, DeRose does not disclose or suggest a need to look outside an individual document to retrieve information by either indexing for files or scanning the files.

On page five in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 6, 29, and 46 that DeRose does not teach the step of "indexing each file and a first level of each book of a predetermined folder for files of a first type," it is asserted that DeRose teaches that each Web site comprises a table of contents (index) of related HTML documents, thus indexing of each file and a first level of each book (documents) for files of a first type (related files or documents) is inherently included in DeRose's teaching of "Web site." It is further asserted that each of the files is further scanned for HTML meta-tags for adding data to a table of contents which lists elements of the individual file. Each element is asserted to be further scanned for the element's table of contents.

Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not teach that a "Web site" generates a table of contents after indexing for files of a first type. At best, DeRose discloses that a "Web site" contains documents that can be organized through a table of contents. However, it is respectfully submitted that a table of contents associated with a Web site is not generated dynamically. Rather, it is created by the Web site designer and must be updated manually when information changes. Thus, if a link in the table of contents changes and the table of contents is not manually updated, the entry in the table of contents will cease to function. This is precisely one of the problems that the present invention attempts to resolve. Because the table of contents for a Web site must be

manually updated, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not disclose or suggest a method by which a Web site indexes for files of a first type as a step in a method for generating a table of contents.

In addition, DeRose does not disclose or suggest any method for scanning separate, individual files for HTML meta-tags in order to determine data to be added to a table of contents. As discussed previously, the table of contents that are created by DeRose are for the contents of an individual document. Since DeRose is concerned with allowing a user to access portions contained within an individual file, DeRose does not disclose or suggest any method for scanning outside each of the individual files to gather information to generate a table of contents for the collections of individual files. Thus, even if DeRose discloses "Web sites" that comprise a table of contents, since the table of contents for a Web site are manually updated and DeRose is concerned with the contents of individual files and not collections of files, DeRose does not disclose or suggest that the table of contents is dynamically generated either after indexing each file for *files* of a first type or after scanning the *files* of a first type for at least one HTML meta-tag of a predetermined type in order to determine the data to be added to a table of contents.

Independent claims 29, 46, and 57 recite similar elements to those discussed above with regard to claim 6, and are, therefore, patentably distinguishable over DeRose for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claim 6.

Dependent claims 7-15, 30-38, 47-56, and 58-59 variously depend from claims 6, 29, 46, and 57, and are, therefore, patentably distinguishable over DeRose for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claims 6, 29, 46, and 57. In addition, other features of the present invention recited in these claims are not suggested by DeRose.

2. CLAIMS 8, 31, AND 48

With regards to the rejection of claims 8, 31, and 48, it is respectfully submitted that DeRose does not teach that the file can be a text file with a creator designation. As pointed out in the Applicants' previous response, the reference given in the Office Action (DeRose, col. 15, lines 23-25) discusses the use of additional style elements in the

electronic document. [See DeRose, col. 14, lines 40-44: "The header information is defined by style definition for a "#header" style in a style sheet for the given document type definition of the selected SGML document. This "#header" style should not be confused with a <header> element, but is rather a reserved style name."]. These style elements are used to place additional information either before (the "#header") or after (the "#footer") sections of the document. In other words, style elements format how information contained within a particular document is laid out and displayed to a user.

A creator designation, however, is a characteristic of the document itself — it is a specification of which program created the given file. Since a "style element" does not identify the source or type of a document, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the use of creator designations. Accordingly, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the particular aspect of the present invention recited in claims 8, 31, and 48.

On pages 5-6 in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 8, 31, and 48 that DeRose does not teach a "creator designator," it is asserted that Applicants appear to read limitations from the specification into the claims. It is further asserted that the limitation "creator designation," by itself, cannot be interpreted as having the function of defining a file's type or class, because its function of defining the file's type or class is not recited in the claim. Thus, it is contended that DeRose's teaching of the content appended to the document reads on the claimed "creator designation." It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action interprets the claim terminology in a manner that is not consistent with its commonly understood meaning.

According to M.P.E.P. § 2111, during examination of the pending claims, "the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims must . . . be consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach." [M.P.E.P. § 2111]. This means that "the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification." [M.P.E.P. § 2111.01]. Accordingly, pending claims cannot be interpreted so broadly that the meaning given to the terms used in the claims is no longer consistent with the ordinary meaning of those terms. Therefore, in

asserting that DeRose's teaching of the content appended to the document reads on the claimed "creator designation," it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are being read more broadly than is consistent with the ordinary meaning of the term "creator designation."

A creator designation, according to its "plain meaning," is a characteristic of the document itself. A creator designation designates the type of file the document is or the class of files to which the document belongs. In other words, the creator designation is a specification of which program created the given file. For example, creator designations are used in the Macintosh® operating system to associate files with executable programs (*e.g.*, Microsoft Word documents with the Microsoft Word program). As another example, the Windows® operating system uses the three-digit suffix of the 8.3 file naming convention to perform the same function (*e.g.*, ".doc" associates Microsoft Word documents with the Microsoft Word program). [See the present application at page 7, lines 12-18]. In contrast, style elements format how information contained within a particular document is laid out and displayed to a user.

By interpreting "creator designation" — which specifies the type of a file or the class to which a file belongs — so broadly that it reads on style elements — which are used to format information contained within a document for display — it is respectfully submitted that the term "creator designation" is being improperly interpreted beyond the term's plain meaning. Interpreting the term "creator designation" to mean "style element" renders the term inconsistent with its plain meaning, since a "style element" does not identify the source or type of a document. Therefore, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that DeRose's teaching of the content appended to the document does not read on the claimed "creator designation."

It should also be noted that, because DeRose deals with individual documents, DeRose has no need to use creator designations. In other words, since DeRose is used to organize the information contained within an individual document, DeRose does not teach a method for scanning numerous, individual files to locate information outside an individual document. Since DeRose does not teach a method of scanning numerous, individual files,

DeRose does not require a method of uniquely identifying these files to expedite file identification. Thus, contrary to the assertions specified in the Office Action, DeRose does not teach the use of a "creator designation" which defines a file's type or source.

3. CLAIMS 10, 33, AND 50

With regards to the rejection of claims 10, 33, and 50, it is respectfully submitted that DeRose does not disclose or suggest a method for generating a table of contents based on a multi-file system. As pointed out in Applicant's previous response and as discussed previously, because DeRose is focused on the contents of an individual file and not collections of files, DeRose teaches away from any such method as being contrary to the stated objectives of DeRose. [See DeRose, col. 4, lines 34-39]. Thus, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the particular aspect of the present invention recited in claims 10, 33, and 50.

On page five in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 10, 33, and 50 that DeRose fails to teach the generation of a table of contents of a computerized help system comprised of numerous files, it is asserted that DeRose teaches the retrieval of numerous individual files (documents) through the WWW. It is further asserted that for each file, a table of contents for the file is generated to help in downloading a specific portion of the file instead of the entire file, thus avoiding processing waste.

As discussed previously, the objective of DeRose is to provide a mechanism for accessing only a portion of the information contained within a large electronically published document to avoid the document management problems associated with maintaining collections of small document fragments. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, how collections of individual documents are organized, on a "Web site" for example, is not a concern of DeRose, as a result of which DeRose does not teach how a table of contents for the numerous individual documents can be generated. Since DeRose specifically teaches a method for breaking down a single document into smaller parts to facilitate retrieval of portions of that document, it is respectfully submitted that DeRose

fails to teach the generation of a table of contents of a computerized help system comprised of numerous individual files.

4. CLAIMS 11, 34, AND 51

On page six in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 11, 34, and 51 that DeRose does not teach the use of an HTML template for generating the table of contents, it is asserted that DeRose discloses at column 19, lines 4-22 and in Figure 9 (#160) the HTML template used for generating the table of contents. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not indicate the use of templates to format the table of contents, but merely the use of a type of style definition which specifies what are the various titles in the document.

As discussed by DeRose, the table of contents display retrieves the title information for the siblings of a selected element, the children of the selected element, and the siblings of ancestors of the selected element. The resulting table of contents document includes the printed titles of each section as hypertext links to those sections. However, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not disclose the step of formatting the table of contents using an HTML template. A template is a file or form that defines the layout of a document. Although according to DeRose the table of contents is displayed to a user, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not disclose or suggest that the displayed table of contents is laid out according to a file or form (i.e., a template) that defines the layout of DeRose's table of contents document. DeRose uses style elements (i.e., title bearers) to generate the table of contents, but these style elements do not define the layout of DeRose's table of contents.

5. CLAIMS 12, 35, AND 52

With regards to the rejection of claims 12, 35, and 52, it is respectfully submitted that DeRose does not implicitly include that the table of contents is provided upon user request. DeRose generates a table of contents, so long as the "title bearer" style definitions are present within the document. No determination is made by DeRose as to whether or

not a table of contents should be generated — if the title bearer style definitions exist, DeRose generates a table of contents. [See DeRose, col. 18, line 59 - col. 19, line 3]. Rather, depending on the size of the portion of the document selected by the user, either the document portion itself is sent and displayed to the user, or, if the portion is too large, a table of contents is sent and displayed to the user instead. [See DeRose, col. 13, lines 18-23]. Thus, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the particular aspect of the present invention recited in claims 12, 35, and 52.

On page 6 in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to the Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 12, 35, and 52 that DeRose does not implicitly include that the table of contents is provided upon user request, it is asserted that the table of contents is provided in response to the user selection of the book which sends a signal (implicitly included) requesting the displaying of the table of contents. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, as discussed previously, no mechanism for determining whether a table of contents should be generated upon user request (as that contemplated by the present invention) is taught by DeRose. Rather, depending on the size of the portion of the document selected by the user, either the document portion itself is sent and displayed to the user, or, if the portion is too large, a table of contents is sent and displayed to the user instead. [See DeRose, col. 13, lines 18-23].

In addition, DeRose generates a table of contents to facilitate user input. DeRose discloses a mechanism for determining whether a table of contents needs to be *displayed*, and displays the table of contents to facilitate user input to begin access to portions of the document. As discussed by DeRose, "[a] variety of mechanisms may [be] used for obtaining from a user a desired starting point from which rendering of a document may begin. One mechanism is a table of contents from which a section of a document may be selected" [DeRose, col. 11, lines 38-41]. In other words, according to DeRose, if the document is large enough then the table of contents is displayed first, in response to which a user inputs a request to view a selected portion of a document. As discussed by DeRose, "a table of contents is generated for a document upon receipt of an indication of an element within that document." [DeRose, col. 18, lines 57-59]. The "element" referred

to is not a user input, but instead the title bearer style element discussed previously. Therefore, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not disclose that the table of contents is provided in response to the user selection of the book which sends a signal requesting the displaying of the table of contents. Rather, DeRose generates a table of contents based on embedded style elements and provides the table of contents *before* a user makes a request in order to facilitate such requests.

6. CLAIMS 15, 38, AND 59

With regards to the rejection of claims 15, 38, and 59, DeRose does not contemplate the determination of whether a table of contents is to be generated. As discussed previously, DeRose discloses a mechanism for determining whether a table of contents needs to be *displayed*. [See DeRose, col. 13, lines 18-21]. Consequently, since DeRose does not disclose or suggest a mechanism for determining whether a table of contents needs be *generated* (as that contemplated by the present invention), DeRose does not disclose or suggest the particular aspect of the present invention recited in claims 15, 38, and 59.

On page 6 in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to the Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 15, 38, and 59 that DeRose does not contemplate the determination of whether a table of contents is to be generated, it is asserted that a table of contents is generated and displayed based upon user input and is generated if it is determined that the size of a document is too large. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, as discussed previously, DeRose makes a determination as to whether or not to *display* the generated table of contents. In addition, as discussed previously, a table of contents is generated in order to facilitate user input. Consequently, no such mechanism for determining whether a table of contents needs to be *generated* (as that contemplated by the present invention) is taught by DeRose.

7. CLAIMS 55 AND 56

On page seven in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to Applicants' argument regarding the rejection of claims 55 and 56 that DeRose does not teach the generation of a table of contents only if a template exists, it is asserted that a template is disclosed by DeRose and that the table of contents is created based on the template and, thus, the determining whether the template exists is implicitly included in DeRose.

As was discussed previously, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, DeRose does not disclose or suggest the use of templates for creating the table of contents, because DeRose does not disclose or suggest the use of a file or form that defines the layout of a document (i.e., the table of contents). As noted previously, DeRose uses a type of style definition which specifies what are the various titles in the document. These titles are then retrieved and placed in the table of contents. However, DeRose does not disclose, either implicitly or explicitly, that a file or form is used to control the placement and format of the titles within the table of contents.

Furthermore, DeRose does not teach the generation of a table of contents only if the template exists. Rather, DeRose will only generate a table of contents if the electronic document contains the necessary title bearer style elements. [See DeRose, col. 18, lines 33-34]. Thus, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, since DeRose does not disclose or suggest the use of templates, DeRose does not disclose or suggest — either implicitly or explicitly — the generation of a table of contents only when the template exists.

8. SUMMARY OF CLAIMS 6-15, 29-38, AND 46-59

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that DeRose does not anticipate or otherwise suggest the subject matter of claims 6-15, 29-38, and 46-59. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

III. CLAIMS 1-5, 16-28, 39-45, AND 60-61

In the fourth section of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 16-28, 39-45, and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over DeRose in view of Walls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,410) (hereinafter "Walls"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed earlier, DeRose specifically teaches away from a method of creating a table of contents based upon numerous, individual information files (*i.e.*, a multi-file system) as being contrary to the stated objective of the invention. [See DeRose, col. 4, lines 34-39]. Walls, however, teaches a method of searching one or more files within a file system to provide the user with an updated index. Since DeRose specifically teaches away from the use of multiple files, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify its system in a manner which goes against the express teachings of DeRose. Therefore, since the teachings of DeRose and Walls are directed to disparate objectives, and in fact are contrary to each other, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of DeRose and Walls (or DeRose and any other teaching which suggests the use of a multi-file system).

With regards to the rejection of claim 60, the Office Action acknowledges that DeRose fails to teach the step of determining if the table of contents needs to be generated if the table of contents fails to either exist or be up-to-date. As discussed previously, DeRose does not contemplate the determination of whether a table of contents is to be generated. Rather, DeRose discloses a mechanism for determining whether a table of contents needs to be *displayed*. Therefore, since DeRose does not disclose or suggest the determination of whether a table of contents is to be generated, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the determining if the table of contents needs to be generated if it fails to either exist or be up-to-date.

On page 7 in the fifth section of the Office Action, in response to Applicants' arguments regarding the rejection of claims 1-5, 16-28, and 39-45, it is again asserted that

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Walls' teaching of creating the up-to-date table of contents with DeRose. The motivation for such a combination is asserted to be the provision of an up-to-date table of contents. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, as discussed previously, it is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Walls with the teachings of DeRose, since one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the DeRose system in a manner which goes against the express teachings of DeRose.

Additionally, it is asserted in the Office Action that Walls' index is a table of headers in a set of files displayed to the user in a graphical representation of a directory or tree of a file system, and is thus a table of contents. Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, Walls' index is not a table of headers in a set of files. Rather, Walls' index is comprised of the information that is contained *within* the file, not the files themselves.

According to Walls, to reduce the amount of time needed to create the index, only the header of each file is searched for index-organizing elements that characterize subjects of the information contained within the file system and the corresponding location elements that identify which of the files contains the subject characterized by the corresponding index-organizing elements. [See Walls, col. 3, lines 55-59]. It should be noted that the location elements do not describe where a particular file is located, but rather specify to the user the name of the file in which the corresponding information is located. Once the continuous indexer disclosed by Walls extracts from the files the index-organizing elements and descriptive elements, the indexer organizes these elements in a predetermined format, such as in alphabetical order. [See, e.g., Walls, figure 8]. Thus, Walls does not list the headers of a set of files, but instead lists the contents of the headers of a set of files. Consequently, the index which is created by Walls enables a user to efficiently search files to locate a particular item of information. In contrast, a table of contents, according to the present invention, is designed to provide the user with a high-level overview of the structure and layout of a file or collection of files in a computer system. Therefore, contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, the index, as contemplated in Walls, is not the same as a table of contents, as contemplated by the present invention.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-5, 16-28, and 39-45 is neither disclosed nor otherwise suggested by DeRose and Walls, whether considered individually or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. CONCLUSION

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, because the Amendment places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; does not present any additional claims; and places the application in better form for an appeal should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

All of the rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, he is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Andrew J. Bateman
Andrew J. Bateman
Registration No. 45,573

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: March 7, 2001

Attachment: Marked-Up Copy of Claims

**Attachment to Amendment After Final Rejection in Response to
Final Office Action Dated November 7, 2000**

Marked-Up Copy of Claims

2. (Twice Amended) A method for displaying information to a user of a computer system, comprising the steps of:

activating a computerized information system;

dynamically generating a table of contents in response to said activation by indexing each file and book of a predetermined folder for files of a first type and scanning said files of a first type for at least one HTML meta-tag of a predetermined type in order to determine data to be added to said table of contents; and

displaying said dynamically generated table of contents;

wherein said computer system displays an up-to-date listing of available information.

25. (Twice Amended) An apparatus for displaying information to a user of a computer system, comprising:

a viewer for dynamically generating a list of books currently available to the user;

and

a display device for displaying said list of currently available books;

wherein said viewer dynamically generates said list of books in response to a request by indexing each file and book of a predetermined folder for files of a first type and scanning said files of a first type for at least one HTML meta-tag of a predetermined type in order to determine data to be added to said list of books.